



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Viriginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/937,991	01/23/2002		Hirofumi Yura	33944	8819	
116	7590	09/24/2004		EXAMINER		
PEARNE &			KRISHNAN, GANAPATHY			
SUITE 1200		EEI	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
CLEVELAN	CLEVELAND, OH 44114-3108				1623	
				DATE MAILED: 09/24/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/937,991	YURA ET AL.				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Ganapathy Krishnan	1623				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 26 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a				
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe date on which the petition under 37 CFI	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension				
fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offictimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	the shortened statutory period for reply one later than three months after the mail FR 1.704(b).	originally set in the final Office action; or ing date of the final rejection, even if				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR						
2. \square The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) they raise new issues that would require furthe	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);				
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be	elow);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	better form for appeal by mater	rially reducing or simplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without cancelingNOTE: .	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	on(s):					
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would lead canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	· · ———	parate, timely filed amendment				
The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see continuation sheet.						
	The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly					
For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		.,				
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-3 and 6-12</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.						
D. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10. Other:		JAMES OF TOOM SUPPRISORY PATERT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CONTER 1600				
		ECHINOLOGI CONTRACTOR				

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No.

Applicants argue that Tay's use of Nilsson's process will not activate all of the OH groups in the polyvinyl alcohol used by Tay and hence Tay's polymer will not have a glycosaminoglycan in every repeating unit. This is not found to be persuasive. Since polyvinyl alcohol has only one OH group per repeat unit activation of all OH groups will take place unless applicants can show experimentally that this is not the case in the process of Tay and Joh. The rejection of claims 1-3 and 6-12 are being maintained.